



MARKSCHEME

May 2012

HISTORY

Route 2

Higher Level

**Paper 3 – Aspects of the history
of the Americas**

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IB Cardiff.*

*Paper 3 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for paper 3 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 77–81. They are intended to assist marking, but must be used in conjunction with the full markbands found in the guide. **For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate's work please contact your team leader.***

0:	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.
1–2:	Answers do not meet the demands of the question and show little or no evidence of appropriate structure. There is little more than unsupported generalization.
3–4:	There is little understanding of the question. Historical knowledge is present but the detail is insufficient. Historical context or processes are barely understood and there are little more than poorly substantiated assertions.
5–6:	Answers indicate some understanding of the question, but historical knowledge is limited in quality and quantity. Understanding of historical processes may be present but underdeveloped. The question is only partially addressed.
7–8:	The demands of the question are generally understood. Relevant, historical knowledge is present but is unevenly applied. Knowledge is narrative or descriptive in nature. There may be limited argument that requires further substantiation. Critical commentary may be present. An attempt to place events in historical context and show an understanding of historical processes. An attempt at a structured approach, either chronological or thematic has been made.
9–11:	Answers indicate that the question is understood, but not all implications considered. Knowledge is largely accurate. Critical commentary may be present. Events are generally placed in context, and historical processes, such as comparison and contrast, are understood. There is a clear attempt at a structured approach. Focus on AO1, AO2 and AO4. Responses that simply summarize the views of historians cannot reach the top of this markband.
12–14:	Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Relevant in-depth knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary is used to indicate some in-depth understanding, but is not consistent throughout. Events are placed in context and there is sound understanding of historical processes and comparison and contrast. Evaluation of different approaches may be used to substantiate arguments presented. Synthesis is present, but not always consistently integrated. Focus on AO3 and AO4.
15–17:	Answers are clearly structured and focused, have full awareness of the demands of the question, and if appropriate may challenge it. Accurate and detailed historical knowledge is used convincingly to support critical commentary. Historical processes such as comparison and contrast, placing events in context and evaluating different interpretations are used appropriately and effectively. Answers are well-structured and balanced and synthesis is well-developed and supported with knowledge and critical commentary.
18–20:	Answers are clearly focused with a high degree of the awareness of the question and may challenge it successfully. Knowledge is extensive, accurately applied and there may be a high level of conceptual ability. Evaluation of different approaches may be present as may be understanding of historical processes as well as comparison and contrast where relevant. Evaluation is integrated into the answer. The answer is well-structured and well-focused. Synthesis is highly developed.

Independence movements

1. With reference to *two* countries of the Americas, analyse the contribution of political factors to the outbreak of the wars of independence.

The focus of this question is on the political aspects. While candidates may be rewarded for developing relevant economic, social, and intellectual factors contributing to wars of independence. Without in-depth development of political factors, marks beyond **[10 marks]** cannot be achieved.

British America

Political factors could include: different concepts of government – division of authorities; rights as Englishmen; British use of writs of assistance; closing down of colonial assemblies; authority to tax without representation. Other factors could include: restrictions of colonial economic development and enforcement of mercantilist policies; development of nationalism; impact of Enlightenment ideas.

Spanish America

Political factors could include: domination of government and administrative positions by *peninsulares*; gradual elimination of Creoles' participation in local assemblies (and therefore deprivation of political, social and economic benefits), and in the Church hierarchy; different perceptions of loyalties to the king (the Spanish king held captive by Napoleon). Other factors, in addition to those mentioned under British America, could include: traditional animosity between Creoles and *peninsulares*.

Candidates may opt to analyse the specificities of the Portuguese Americas (Brazil) and/or French Americas (Haiti). In the case of Brazil, the main political cause was the recall of the Portuguese King from Brazil to Portugal and the subsequent demands he placed on Brazil as a colony of Portugal. In the case of Haiti, the political factor was the French government's denial of citizenship and political rights to the Haitians and its refusal to end slavery.

If only one country is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

2. Why did both the military and civilians oppose or join Latin American wars of independence? Answer with reference to *two* wars of independence from the region.

Much depends upon the particular wars chosen. With regard to the role of the military in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, mention might be made of a common military phenomenon – the effects of the Seven Years’ War. It could be argued that not only the Bourbon reforms but also Napoleon’s military activities in the peninsula destroyed the legitimacy of the Spanish crown and opened the gates for the independence movements in Spanish America. A different role of the military can be seen with Brazil: the instability caused by Napoleon’s 1807 military invasion of Portugal and the subsequent exile of Dom Pedro to Brazil; Brazil’s struggle for independence was less bloody due to Portugal’s military weakness, unlike those of the Spanish colonial power (major wars in the Caribbean, Mexico, Nueva Granada, Peruvian and Rio de la Plata territories).

Civilian: the Bourbon reorganization of trade and commerce (less rigid controls) aggravated the long-standing animosities between Creoles and *peninsulares*. The socio-economic situation of the Creoles helped determine whether or not they supported the war; its leaders were attracted by ideas of the Enlightenment, though mention could be made of the brilliance of Bolivar’s military tactical sense as well as his ability to attract both ends of the social spectrum, be it the masses (“Decree of War to Death”) or the elite (“Letter from Jamaica”). Mexico can be used as an example of war that started with a social agenda – not to give more to lower classes: the Haitian revolution was unique in starting with a slave rebellion.

Candidates using the Spanish-American War of 1898 for the question have made a poor choice as it doesn’t fit the time period of the curriculum unit. However, since the question doesn’t specify any dates, accept it as applicable, but only if the actions of the Cuban military and civilians are addressed, as opposed to the US military and civilians. The question is not about foreign military, but rather domestic military.

If only one war is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

Nation-building and challenges

3. For what reasons, and in which ways, did the United States Constitution of 1787 change the Articles of Confederation?

The best answers will show familiarity with the evidence for the economic and political problems that caused Americans to question the effectiveness of the Articles, as well as detailed evidence of the ways in which specific items of the Constitution addressed these issues.

Possible reasons could include: economic and political troubles of 1780s – multiple currencies; public debt; Shays’ Rebellion; inter-state taxation, inter-state tariff wars; boundary conflicts (*e.g.* Virginia, Maryland); weakness of the central government and why this was a problem, (*e.g.* no standing army, inability to tax or regulate commerce); absence of judicial and executive branches of government; necessity of unanimous consent to amend the articles; lack of enforcement power over individuals and states for laws and treaties; weakness in foreign affairs.

Possible ways could include: resolution of conflict through compromise; the creation of a stronger central government; a separate executive branch; a separate judicial branch and establishment of the Supreme Court to arbitrate in cases of dispute between the executive and legislature and between states; a legislature with a division of powers between the Senate and the House of Representatives; greater power for the Congress (*e.g.* power to tax and regulate commerce, establish uniform tariffs), federal in form (not confederate).

Do not expect all of the above issues. Allow some imbalance, but both ‘reasons’ and ‘ways’ must be supported with detailed examples to achieve a strong answer.

As this is a two-part question, if only one part is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

4. **“Socio-political conditions caused the rise and development of the caudillo rule in Latin America during the period immediately after the wars of independence.” With reference to two countries of the region, to what extent do you agree with this statement?**

The rise and rule of the caudillos in nineteenth century Latin America is traditionally understood and explained in terms of the economic, political and social instability and chaos that was created or exacerbated by the wars of independence and the vacuum that arose with the end of Spanish and Portuguese rule. With no middle class and no public opinion, the creole elite were unable to implement and consolidate ideas and visions of a modern liberal nation state. This inability to combat lawlessness and consolidate a stable political, social, economic alternative, meant power was taken up by charismatic leaders for whom the war had provided the military means to consolidate their power. Most arguments will lay the emphasis on one of these three causal factors.

The nature of the rule of any caudillo, like the personalities of the caudillos themselves, varied from case to case (*e.g.* Francia’s and Rosas’ attitudes to foreign trade). However, it could be argued that there were some common factors such as their networks of personal patronage. Distinctions might be made between those who were popular with masses (Rosas) and those who were elitist (the latter sought the support of the aristocracy and the Catholic Church as well as the military *e.g.*; Santa Anna and his Seven Laws); those who attempted to unify their nation (*e.g.* Rosas’s preference for Federalism in Argentina; *c.f.* Santa Anna’s centralisation in Mexico), those who sought to modernize their nation (introducing the typical trappings of a modern infrastructure – roads, railroads, ports, schools), whilst at the same time emphasising, or not, as the case may be, “traditional” values. Others were more concerned with enriching themselves and their henchmen at a more regional level.

Popular choices might be Juan Manuel de Rosas of Argentina, Santa Anna of Mexico, Dr Francia of Paraguay, and Jean-Pierre Boyer in Haiti, although there are plenty of other possibilities, such as Gomez and Artigas.

Candidates may emphasize rise more than development of rule. If so, accept an imbalance between the two. If only one country is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

United States Civil War: causes, course and effects 1840–1877**5. “Sectionalism, not slavery, was the major cause of the United States Civil War.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Amongst the arguments put forward to explain the civil war, one historiographical current argues that the principal cause was sectionalism. Candidates can agree or disagree with this view. However, while other causes might be taken into consideration, their answers should not simply be a review of all potential causes. They should focus primarily on the two demands of the question – sectionalism/slavery – using supporting evidence and analysis. The best answers will manage to separate sectionalism from slavery as causes, while seeing how slavery was an important aspect of the sectionalist disputes.

Aspects of the arguments for slavery as a cause could include: the growth of the anti-slavery movement in North (abolitionist movement; Beecher-Stowe;), pro-slavery in South (reaction to Fugitive Slave Law; Dred Scott case; John Brown’s raid); Northern objections to migrating Southerners’ desires to take their slaves to the Western territories. Aspects of the arguments for sectionalism as a cause could include: a sense of the growing intensity of sectional interests after the 1820 Missouri Compromise and how this was played out, both politically and economically, in Congress. In terms of economics, reference might be made to how the interests of an industrializing North lay in increasing tariffs on imports to protect their own manufactured goods, at the direct expense of the economic interests of a predominantly agricultural, export-oriented south, while the immediate interests of the new Western states were improvements to their infrastructure. In terms of politics, reference might be made to the rising populations in Northern and mid-West states and subsequent increase in Congressional power; the role of the principle of States’ Rights versus Federal Rights; Lincoln’s anti-sectionalist motivation being to save the union rather than abolish slavery.

Better candidates might wish to argue that even concerns about slavery, both pro and anti, were more about the issues of inalienable property rights and political power than the moral issue of slavery.

If only sectionalism or slavery is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks], but allow for some imbalance.

6. To what extent had Reconstruction fulfilled its aims by 1877?

Candidates should identify the aims of Reconstruction and then make an assessment of to what extent they were achieved.

Answers might establish the aims within the broad initiatives of restoration of the Union; the social, political and economic transformation of southern society; and the variety of legislation passed which was aimed at helping freed slaves. Some of the issues that could be discussed are: the Freedmen's Bureau Act, the First (military) and Second Reconstruction Acts, the Force and Amnesty Acts; the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth Amendments and the Civil Rights Acts of 1866, 1870 and 1875.

The Black Codes and emergence of the Ku Klux Klan could be included in the assessment of the limitations of Reconstruction's achievements in terms of the conditions of the African Americans. The absence of substantial economic gains might also deserve emphasis. Similarly, candidates could make a distinction between the aims of the Federal Government and those of the areas of the country where they tried to implement those aims. Others could argue that more aims were fulfilled in the earlier part of Reconstruction than in the latter part.

The development of modern nations 1865–1929

7. Compare and contrast the effects of industrial growth and economic modernization in *two* countries of the Americas between 1865 and 1929.

Answers will vary according to the selected countries, though in all cases social, political as well as economic effects could be discussed.

In the case of the United States and Canada, some of the issues for comparison could be: growth of specific industries; increase of wealth; profits providing capital for further investments; exploitation of natural resources; expansion of “white collar” jobs in administration and service industries; national integration; opportunities for women; growth of union movements; internal and external immigration; greater power in political and economic competition with other nations; end of isolationism; creation of powerful and unregulated corporations; increasing urbanization and poverty in certain sectors; poor conditions for the workers; ethnic and racial conflicts; population increase due to immigration; the growth of movements which criticized the negative aspects of industrialization (*e.g.* Socialists).

In the case of Latin America, issues could include: the effects of the formation of a “centre” and “periphery” economy; export of raw materials and import of manufactures (*e.g.* Argentinean exports rose 500 % from 1870 to 1900; similar figures for Cuban sugar, Chilean nitrates, *etc.*) sustained by foreign investment; neo-colonialism and economic dependency; the increase of immigrants, their conditions and those of workers; concentration of wealth in the hands of upper classes, usually landowners; the formation of labour groups; rise of dictatorial strongmen (*e.g.* Diaz); the emergence of a middle class and its economic and political aspirations.

Do not expect all of the above, but selected examples of the economic, social and political effects of industrial growth and economic modernization, should be supported by analysis and evidence. Allow effects to be either positive or negative and allow for some imbalance between comparison and contrast.

If only one country is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].

8. With reference to *one* country of the region, analyse the role of *either* positivism or “indigenismo” in the development and consolidation of modern states in Latin America between 1865 and 1929.

Candidates might begin by offering a clear definition of the term chosen, and good answers will be aware of how “positivism” or “indigenismo” related to other ideological currents, often referred to generically as “progressivism”, and contextualize this in terms of the situation of the immediate post-independent state. Concrete evidence must be given for how either “positivism” (“order and progress”, rationalism, mathematics, science and technology) or “indigenismo” (the view that native populations, as the majority, should play a dominant role in the new political and social order) affected the social, political and economic aspects of the installation of a westernised notion of “modernity” in the form of a modern “nation state” in any one Latin American country.

Politics: effect on the notions underpinning the new “liberal” political order – the constitution and the limits placed on suffrage; the traditions of *caudillismo*; Economics: the implementation of a liberal economy based on a capitalistic and (pre-) industrialised model; Social: direction by a Europeanized elite; the native Indian population and their traditional ethnic affiliations; the African American population; the peasantry; the new urban industrial working class; the immigrants; issues of “national identity” versus a more traditional and local sense of identity; secular versus religious education. Brazil (the republican movement; Farias Brito), Argentina (anti-clericalism of “the generation of the 1880s”; Ingenieros; Korn) and Mexico (the “científicos” under Porfirio Díaz; Caso and Vasconcelos) might prove popular choices, but allow others, including countries from Central America and the Caribbean.

Do not expect all of the above. Reward candidates for detailed expressions of knowledge and analysis.

Emergence of the Americas in global affairs 1880–1929

9. Compare and contrast the foreign policy of the United States in *two* different Latin American countries between 1880 and 1929.

This question allows for candidates to contextualize US foreign policy at the end of the nineteenth century, in terms of its lack of interest in Europe and its growing strategic and economic concerns with Latin America as a “sphere of influence”. However, responses should not consist of a narrative of interventions, (Cuba and Puerto Rico (1898), Nicaragua (1912, 1924), Mexico (1914, 1916), Haiti (1915), Dominican Republic (1916) and Panama (1907, 1912, 1917, 1925); nor a description of the policies of the Monroe Doctrine, Roosevelt Corollary, “Big Stick”, “Gunboat”, “Dollar” or “Moral” diplomacy. Candidates are required to take a more analytical approach to those actions and policies. The comparisons and contrasts will depend on the two countries chosen. The policies of Roosevelt and Wilson are likely to be favourites for contrast, though the best answers will be aware that, in some cases, Wilson went further than Roosevelt with military intervention.

Possible comparisons could include: policies marked by military interventions (as opposed to threats, non-recognition, economic sanctions); actions driven by notion of US as guardian or policeman of Western hemisphere; action motivated by US economic interests in the region; support and setting up of friendly and stable authoritarian regimes; support of separatist groups; use of local conservative elites/powerful families to achieve ends; strategic interventions.

Possible contrasts could include: different reasons for military interventions; increasingly commercial application of Monroe Doctrine; racist reasons; humanitarian and nationalistic reasons (Spanish–American War 1898; protection of US citizens in Mexico); geo-political reasons (Panama and Roosevelt’s Big Stick).

Do not expect all of the above. If only one country is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks], while detailed descriptive narrative should receive no more than [10 marks]. Reward clearly delineated comparison/contrast structures. Allow for some imbalance between the two, though the best arguments will be supported by detailed evidence of US policies and actions in the region during the time frame stated in the question. FDR’s Good Neighbour policy is outside the time frame of the question.

10. Analyse the social impact of the First World War in *two* countries of the Americas.

Answers will vary according to the selected countries. Some probable choices will be the United States, Canada, Brazil or Argentina. But accept any choice of countries selected by the candidates.

Some of the issues that could be addressed are the antagonisms between various ethnic identities (e.g. tensions between English and French Canadians exacerbated by the conscription crisis, and the “khaki election” of 1917); restrictions on civil liberties and immigration; the rise of a more radicalized working class; gender roles (e.g. women’s suffrage); post-war unemployment; minorities’ status and tensions between traditional values and norms and “new” modern views and popular trends in culture; sense of nationalism.

If only one country is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks]. Reward candidates who look at both the immediate social impact of the war during the war as well as the short and longer term post-war impact.

The Mexican Revolution 1910–1940

11. To what extent were social factors the main cause of the outbreak of revolution in Mexico in 1910?

This is not an essay about the post-1910 developments of the Mexican Revolution and the causes thereof. The question allows candidates to analyse the various causal factors, be they social, cultural, political, or economic, that can be said to have brought about or contributed to the revolutionary outburst in Mexico in 1910. While the focus of this question is on social factors, candidates are welcome to challenge the statement, and in so doing, discuss political or economic factors. Economic or political factors could be argued to be the trigger, but deeper, underlying long-term social factors the main cause.

Social factors could include: social inequality ; “hacendados”, small farmers, displaced indigenous, poorly treated urban workers; violence aimed at powerful and rich elite and rich foreigners; nationalism; revolution aimed at redressing these social imbalances (nationalization of property; stress on education).

Political factors could include: political problems involving transfer of power from the ageing Diaz (caudillos versus científicos; Diaz’s announcement of democratic election and his reaction to Madero’s challenge); revolution was driven by the move to gain political participation (middle class felt excluded).

Economic factors could include: economic prosperity of Porfiriato intensified the economic recession of 1907–1908 and created unrest; economic dependency; Plan de Ayala; agrarian reform; huge wealth disparities (few “hacendados” versus many small farmers and displaced indigenous).

While post-1910 events could be mentioned, they should be referred to in such a way that makes it clear that they are being used as evidence to confirm the candidate’s argument about the predominant causal factors that brought about 1910. The demands of the question require an analytical approach. Thus, a narrative of events leading to the Revolution of 1910 should be marked out of a maximum of [12 marks].

12. For what reasons, and in what ways, were Mexican revolutionary leaders supported by foreign powers, especially the United States, between 1910 and 1922?

Reasons could include: foreign investments in Mexico (land, mining, timber, railroads, oil and *haciendas*); protection of US citizens (40 000 in 1910); importance of Mexico’s natural resources; involvement in the First World War.

Ways could include: economic support; arms sales; the role of associations like the Red Cross; diplomatic recognition; political and military intervention; the role of US in events such as Huerta’s betrayal of Madero (1913); the diplomatic clash leading to the US occupation of Veracruz (1914); support of Carranza; General Pershing’s expedition to Chihuahua (1916) may be used to illustrate the ways in which US influenced the revolution; foreign support for Huerta’s planned counter-revolution; by 1920 support for Obregón’s and Calles’ opposition to Carranza.

Do not expect all of the above. Candidates who address only US involvement may achieve high marks.

The Great Depression and the Americas 1929–1939

13. In what ways, and with what results, did Canada address the problems caused by the Great Depression?

Answers to this question should identify the problems caused by the depression in Canada, the measures taken by the governments, and make an assessment about their effectiveness or limitations. Programs in areas such as agriculture, job creation, social reform and fiscal reform could prove popular choices.

Candidates may show some detailed awareness of the main differences between the King and Bennett governments, and how they illustrate King's laissez faire approach, and Bennett's slightly less radical laissez faire attitude (*e.g.* his two emergency bills for unemployment relief and raised tariffs) and his later more-New-Deal-inspired reform programme, which, in the end, it could be argued, did not live up to expectations.

Problems caused by the Great Depression

Canada's very successful export-based economy (raw materials, manufacturing and agriculture goods to GB and US was 30 % GNP) was dependant on global demand and so greatly affected by the Great Depression. *E.g.* the raising of tariffs in US greatly affected the Prairie Provinces. Drought devastated Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba. Imports fell by 55 %; exports by 25 %. Unemployment rose from 4 % to 27 %. Income in Canada fell by almost 50 %. Population growth contracted, immigration slowed, crime rates increased. The absence of unemployment insurance /social welfare programs saw the rise of a new class of unemployed vagrants. These are some of the problems the Great Depression created for Canada. This would provide a context for discussion for effectiveness of solutions, but should not be the main focus of the essay.

Ways the problems were addressed

1929 Liberal Prime Minister Mackenzie King's laissez faire view saw little Federal Government intervention. 1930 Conservative Prime Minister Bedford Bennett's "protectionist" view (raised tariffs to protect manufactures) led to a trade war 1930–1931. Initial public work schemes and welfare programmes though cut by 1932 due to an increased federal deficit, failed to make an impact on the depression, nor did his "New Deal" inspired "New Policy" (unemployment insurance, a reduced workweek, and minimum wage, central economic planning). Mackenzie King's Liberal government's established a Reciprocal Trade Agreement with the US in 1935. He converted the radio commission to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation; in 1934 the Bank of Canada was created and in 1938 it was nationalized. Finally he fended off provincial demands for more money to support relief programs for the unemployed.

Results

Besides the political instability, and the ensuing social problems, neither Liberal nor Conservative policies had any positive initial impact. Candidates are likely to argue that it was the Second World War which did most to pull the Canadian economy out of the Depression through increased demand, increased government spending, military employment, and the 1939 recovery of the US economy; Canada became an increasingly important market for US goods and underwent a certain amount of economic integration with the US. Long-term results: the increased role of government can be seen as laying the foundations for Canada's welfare state.

Do not expect all of the above but candidates should support their arguments with specific examples. Generalizations will not score well.

As this is a two-part question, if only one part is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

14. Assess the responses to the Great Depression of *either* G Vargas in Brazil *or* the Concordancia in Argentina, in the 1930s.

To assess the responses of either Vargas or the Concordancia, candidates should show some understanding of the nature of Latin American economies on the eve of the Great Depression: export oriented, based on the supply of raw materials for foreign industries; export of farming produce and livestock; outlets for foreign capital investment (government loans for infrastructure projects – transport, communications and cities).

Economic problems to which they had to respond could include: collapse of foreign markets; plunge in prices of its raw materials and foodstuffs (more than manufactured imports); changes in the movement of international capital, inflation, and social problems (land distribution, uneven distribution of income). Political problems: the connection of the politicized minorities and the common people; nationalist and anti-imperialist sectors calling for policies independent of foreign interests and capital; call for increasing state action and state control.

Generally the responses could be classed under state intervention and centralization, industrialization (to reduce dependency); economic nationalism; import substitution; new international foreign trade; political changes. Candidates should show accurate knowledge of government responses in several areas.

Details for Brazil could include:

Oligarchic “old Republic” (“café au lait” alliance between the coffee elites of Sao Paulo, the cattle barons of Minas Gerais and the armed forces), replaced by populist/nationalist Getulio Vargas; dominance of coffee-export economy broken; Vargas’ *conciliação*; restoration of federal unity; establishment of a dictatorship in 1937–1938; creation of Estado Novo (multiclass, pro-industrial, urban-based populist alliance) to neutralize the political opposition (Integralists and the Alliance Libertadora Nacional; modernization; diversification in agriculture; improvements in transport and communications, placing mineral resources and key industries under national ownership, promotion of industrial expansion, and implementation of a new labour code and social welfare system; industrial production increased from 1931 to 1936.

Details for Argentina could include:

General Uriburu’s coup d’état; end of civilian rule under Yrigoyen; rule of Concordancia (a coalition of conservative aristocrats, the Church and the military); the establishment of Juntas Regulatoras; abandonment of free-trade and implementation of conservative policies via state intervention; economic growth dependent on the British “special relation”; The Roca–Runciman Treaty of 1933 promised Argentina a fixed portion of the British chilled beef market and eliminated tariffs on wheat; less of a clear governmental policy towards industrialization, but natural increase in domestic production for local consumerism. After 1934, wheat and meat prices rose as well as industrial investment. Labour movements were repressed.

The Second World War and the Americas 1933–1945

15. How successful were attempts at “hemispheric cooperation” in the region between 1933 and 1945?

Candidates should define “hemispheric cooperation” and assess how successful it proved to be. Issues to be discussed could include: Good Neighbor Policy (arguably an attempt to replace one form of leverage with another); FDR moving towards intervention in Europe (Neutrality Acts). US retreat from direct military intervention (*i.e.* 1934 marines out of Haiti, 1934 abrogation of the Platt Amendment in Cuba), Pan-Americanization of the Monroe Doctrine at various Conferences (*i.e.* 1933, 1936, 1938); Panama, 1939; Havana, 1940; Rio Conference 1942. Strengthening economic ties (*i.e.* 1934 creation of the Export-Import Bank and the passing of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act); and strengthening social and cultural ties (*i.e.* the use of the arts, music, literature to replace one form of leverage with another) and media and goodwill tours to promote a better understanding; the creation in 1941 of the Office of Inter-American Affairs. The war itself can be argued to have strengthened the political and economic links between the US and Latin America, though the different position of Argentina can be noted.

Mere description of hemispheric cooperation without analysis could not achieve high marks.

16. Analyse the measures taken by any *two* countries of the Americas in reaction to the Holocaust.

Answers to this question will vary according to the selected countries, although the US and Canada are likely to be the most popular choices.

Answers may address some of the following aspects: government policies or measures taken or not taken with regard to events affecting the European Jews. Good analytical discussions of the internal measures suggested, taken or not taken by each country are likely to include reference to immigration quotas; granting of asylum; provisions made for and assistance given to newcomers; conditions confronted by the refugees (*e.g.* St. Louis liner). External measures include the discussion of other possible responses such as rescue missions, the bombing of railroads, *etc.*

Candidates may consider the extent to which these measures (or their absence) were responses to public pressures; the role of external factors behind the reaction, such as international diplomatic pressures, as well as the practical difficulties faced by each country in taking these actions, as well as the degree of anti-Semitism in the selected countries during the 1930s.

Analysis may be demonstrated by discussing motives and/or effectiveness/ineffectiveness of the measures.

If only one country is discussed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks]. No allowance should be made for emotional responses. Only analytical remarks supported by firm historical evidence can reach the higher markbands.

Political developments in the Americas after the Second World War 1945–1979

17. Assess the successes and failures of Nixon’s domestic policies (1969–1974).

Candidates will need to show concrete evidence of their familiarity with Nixon’s domestic social, political and economic aims and reforms. Assessment might take into account a consideration of the problems that Nixon faced when he became President. The best answers will assess the short-term and long-term success or failure of his policies.

Nixon’s domestic policies:

Social policy

His administration’s record in respect to environmental reform; Nixon’s policies towards civil rights (desegregation of schools) and equal rights and welfare reforms.

Possible assessment

Nixon supported passage of the Clean Air Act(1970) as well as the establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Occupational, Health and Safety Administration (OSHA); Welfare activists at the time saw his Family Assistance Programme of 1969 as inadequate; others argue that his welfare reforms contributed to later budget deficits; some would say his support for states’ rights and his Southern Strategy delayed desegregation, while others would point out the increased integration of schools during his Presidency.

Economic policy

Keynesian economics and deficit spending; temporary wage and price freezes; dollar taken off gold standard.

Possible assessment

Short-term success in that it helped the US to get out of the 1970s recession, but it also contributed to significant budget problems.

Political policy

Nixon’s appeal to the “silent majority” (those who were against the Vietnam war protests, black militants and measures to achieve racial balance). His “Southern Strategy” aimed at winning the votes of the traditional Southern Democrats. His “New Federalism” sought to shift many responsibilities from the federal to the state and local level.

Possible assessment

Nixon’s significant victory in the 1972 election made the Watergate revelations and scandals of 1973 all the more surprising. Watergate, while evidently a failure for Nixon, was not a political “policy”. Candidates should focus on its implication for the political system. Long-term success: his environmental protection policy has recently been seen as forward looking. Some credit Nixon with having brought about a general political shift in public opinion toward conservatism. Others argue that his “Southern Strategy” was instrumental in causing a shift of white Southern Democrats to the Republican Party, thus a prelude to the current political alignment. This was also the basis of the Republican gains that successfully challenged the Democratic control of Congress in the 1980s and 1990s. The “New Federalism” caused significant economic strain on state and local budgets but offered some increase in local control.

- 18. To what extent did domestic dissent and disorder become a rationale for Latin American military regimes to intervene in their country's internal affairs between 1945 and 1979? Answer with reference to *two* Latin American countries.**

To answer this question well, candidates will have to provide an idea of the condition of the countries in which the military intervened as well as the particular reasons why they intervened in those particular countries. This is not a question about the results of that military intervention or the policies pursued by those military regimes.

Aspects of domestic dissent and disorder could include: the intensification of long-term social and economic inequalities that have often been the well-springs of conflict in Latin America; social, political and economic crisis; increase of manifestations within an increasingly ideological framework; frustration of efforts to consolidate post-Second World War social democracies; student activism; spread of guerrilla movements; perceived weakness of the state. Other factors could include: the disproportionate influence of armed forces within government; its relationship with the Church; military considered themselves as guardians of national values and thus a guarantee against communism and the only institution capable of preventing chaos; military saw themselves as modernizers, committed to nationalism, industrialization and technology, and thus reacting against “communism” (which gained them support from both inside the country and from foreign powers); Cold War reasons – “national security doctrine”; the impact of the 1959 Cuban revolution.

Chile, Argentina and Brazil are likely to prove popular choices, although other valid cases can be accepted. Vargas of Brazil is only pertinent during his second presidency, 1951–1954. If only one country is mentioned, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].

The Cold War and the Americas 1945–1981

19. Examine the features of Eisenhower’s “New Look” foreign policy and evaluate its impact on the region of the Americas.

Eisenhower’s “New Look” policy was his administration’s response to the demands of national security in the context of trying to balance: (a) his government’s financial concerns about reducing the US military budget, and (b) US military capacity in an escalating Cold War, in which Europe and the Middle East were beginning to play a greater role, and the nuclear arms race which this entailed. Hence, the administration relied on strategic nuclear weapons and maximum response as a deterrent to potential conventional and nuclear threats from the USSR and her allies (Dulles and NSC162/2). It could be argued that the “New Look” policy was concerned mainly with Europe and the Middle East, and, as a result, did not have any great direct effect upon the region. While one could argue for the basic “neglect” of the US foreign policy toward Latin America after 1945 due to its concern with the events in Europe, the trend for “hemispheric cooperation” could be seen in the formation of the OAS. Latin America became the focus of concern for the US mainly after the Cuban Revolution in 1959.

At the same time, the “New Look” policy could be argued to have had an indirect effect upon US foreign policy in the region in so far as it was concerned with the maintenance of the status quo and stability in the region in order to protect US economic interests in the face of a rising communist threat. Candidates might successfully argue that the unstated implication of the policy (with its focus on nuclear deterrents in Europe and Asia) was to give greater emphasis to covert methods of achieving US objectives in Latin America. They may also examine the development of US economic interests in the region in light of this “new” concern, for example: US reaction to Arbenz’s arrival in power in Guatemala in 1954 and the threat his land reforms offered to the American United Fruit Company’s interests. US relations with Cuba in the 1950’s also provide much potential material to explore this question since Eisenhower authorized planning for the Bay of Pigs Invasion of Cuba and initiated an economic boycott of the island. Candidates may argue convincingly that the Cuban Missile Crisis was a long-term effect, but do not allow narratives of the crisis.

Be open to an approach which treats separately the features of the “New Look” policy from the impact on the Region and responses that have some imbalance between the two elements.

20. Analyse the reasons for the United States’ involvement in Vietnam between 1953 and 1968.

Reasons common to all presidencies

Cold War context of ideological clash between communism and capitalism; US foreign policy, based on “domino” effect and “theory of containment”.

Eisenhower’s involvement

He took a limited interventionist approach: between 1953 and 1961 Eisenhower provided massive economic and military aid to South Vietnam, but limited US direct troop involvement to a small advisory staff; refusal to directly assist French at Dienbienphu

Reasons

These were based on French withdrawal in 1954, victory of communism in the North; the perceived failure of Truman’s “soft” approach in China and Korea. Having said that, Eisenhower was reluctant to send troops and risk another war in Asia so soon after Korea.

Kennedy’s involvement

He increased military advisers to train South Vietnam troops to combat the growing guerrilla warfare; allowed the Central Intelligence Agency to participate in the coup against Diem; increased economic and military aid to South Vietnam.

Reasons

Perceived lack of success of Eisenhower’s policy and increased insurgency; conditions in South declining. Kennedy saw Vietnam as vital to the international prestige of the US in the Cold War in respect of Khrushchev’s support of liberation movements. Another more problematic reason was that US government response was based on often contrary and misleading information.

Johnson’s involvement

By the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution Johnson greatly increased the US commitment in Vietnam supplying more military equipment and sending task forces of specially trained troops; US troop strength at 540 000 by end of Johnson’s presidency; extensive use of bombing campaigns against the Viet Cong and North Vietnam.

Reasons

Johnson, like Kennedy, hesitated to send troops to fight in the South, even though it was not going well. A popular argument might be to see the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in the context of Johnson’s re-election concerns and the result of opinion polls indicating that the US public wanted victory in Vietnam but were not willing to involve troops or resources to secure it; as well as the fear of the US “losing” another country to communism; and attacks from Congress that Johnson’s Democrats were “soft on Communism”; Johnson’s initial trust in advice of US military leaders.

The core of all answers should be reasons for US involvement. If, in order to support the argument, there is a brief discussion of the methods by which the war was fought or an assessment of one particular president’s initiative, they are to be allowed. If a candidate addresses only a part of the time period, it would mean that not all the implications of the question were considered”.

Candidates could address the reasons specific to each president as well as reasons general to all three. Chronology should be balanced by and interwoven with analysis, and placed firmly in the context of the Cold War. For generalizations about “fear of communism”, mark out of a maximum of [9–10 marks], even if containment was the common denominator of these years.

Civil rights and social movements in the Americas

21. To what extent can Martin Luther King be said to have achieved his goals in the Civil Rights movement?

Martin Luther King's goals should be identified, and the degree to which he achieved them needs to be assessed. This should not be a narrative of the Civil Rights movement. Some of King's goals that could be mentioned are: end discrimination and segregation (*e.g.* rights to travel; share public facilities – restaurants, toilets, schools – with white citizens); be addressed with respect; change attitudes of the racists; eliminate legal and unofficial restrictions on voting rights and other rights as US citizens; eliminate "Jim Crow" laws. Win support of white America by pursuing these aims using the method of a direct action, nonviolent protest. Clear successes: 1956 Supreme Court declares Alabama segregation laws unconstitutional (Montgomery's bus boycott 1955); Marches for blacks' right to vote, labour rights and other basic civil rights (*e.g.* March on Washington); 1964 Civil Rights Act; 1965 Voting Rights Act.

Limited achievements: post-1965 acknowledgement of continued economic discrimination and issue of poverty; African Americans faced more economic hardship than whites; limited success of post-1966 campaign in the North against poverty, and the more subtle discrimination that was manifest in issues related to housing, schooling and employment; limits of his method in the eyes of the more militant wing of African American movement *e.g.* the Black Power movement, Malcolm X; King's criticism of the Vietnam war caused some loss of support; King also faced allegations that his movement had been infiltrated by Communists and he became an object of hatred on the right. His assassination in 1968 left much still to be done, including the issue of segregation.

Do not expect all of the above, but reward balanced and analytical answers which recognize some of the limitations that Martin Luther King encountered in the achievements of his goals. Candidates might even question whether these successes should be attributed simply to Martin Luther King, notwithstanding his qualities as a leader.

22. Compare and contrast the impact of the Feminist movements in *two* countries of the Americas after 1945.

Much depends upon how candidates define “feminism”. The aim of this question is to have candidates highlight some of the ways in which “feminism”, or more broadly “the women’s movement” of the 50 years between the end of the Second World War and the end of the twentieth century can be seen: (a) as a single movement aimed at overturning the legal or practical obstacles to gender equality and “women’s rights”, and/or (b) a series of different movements and the different ways in which its concerns and aims developed in particular countries.

Popular areas of discussion and comparison will no doubt be official inequality (voting rights and participation in political process) and unofficial individual inequalities (sexism); family and reproduction (contraception); workplace and professional opportunities; education. Strategies of protest *e.g.* popular mass protests; strikes; literature; art; journalism; private groups; successes and failures.

Popular arguments and observations could include how the feminist movement became fused with other movements (civil rights; the struggles for wider socio-economic rights; the National Organization for Women (NOW) movement); the more “revolutionary feminism” of Latin America (*e.g.* Nicaraguan); how, given the militaristic regimes, the civil wars and the revolutionary struggles for national liberation with which the “feminist” movement was confronted in Latin America in the post-war period, it took on a very different nature (*e.g.* Argentina, Chile and the role of women in the search for disappeared loved ones).

As this is a question about the period 1945–2000, do not allow detailed discussion of the effect of the Second World War on women during the war, though allow candidates to argue that the changes in women’s position and role in society (at one time in one or both of the countries chosen) were more a consequence of wars than of the feminist movement itself. The best answers will address the comparisons and the contrasts in two countries evenly, but allow for some imbalance.

Reward specific historical detail.

If only one country is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].

Into the twenty-first century — from the 1980s to 2000

- 23. “President George H W Bush’s domestic policy (1989–1993) was a failure.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates might choose to approach this question by dividing it into a consideration of the key aims that Bush explicitly set up at the beginning of his presidency, and the aims of the policies put into place to tackle the problems which arose during his term of office. Whether or not this distinction is made explicit, reward the discussion of relevant and specific issues supported by historical evidence and detail. The approach must not be merely a description of his policies but an appraisal of their success and/or failure.

Some of the initial issues that could be considered are: the economic conditions in the US when Bush became president and his subsequent economic measures (*e.g.* Reagan deficit; “no new taxes” pledge; low inflation, rising unemployment); his social policies; his relationship with the press and approach toward social issues; his actions with regard to the Savings and Loan crisis; his stance on the environment; Americans with disabilities; education; fiscal policies should be taken into consideration for a balanced assessment. Issues that developed during his presidency could include: the race riots of 1992; the economic recession.

- 24. “Economic challenges helped bring about the restoration of democracy in Latin America during the 1980s.” Discuss this statement with reference to *one* country of the region.**

Answers will vary depending upon the selected country. In all cases, candidates should see this as an opportunity to examine the relationship between the opening toward democracy during drastic economic downturn. In so doing they might challenge the question by arguing, for example, that it was primarily political rather than economic factors that caused the wave of democratization in the 1980s. In all cases they should support their argument with historical evidence related to one country.

Economic problems inherited by the authoritarian regimes established by the military in the 1960s and 1970s arguably included stagnation, unemployment, increased external debt and economic dependency. Other issues to discuss are the extent to which their subsequent economic policies led their nations toward financial ruin; the impact of international recessions (oil crisis of the 70s) and foreign controls (international lending, debt crisis).

Domestic political problems included the influence of the political organizations of civil society; the failure of the political projects of the military regimes (clientelist and corporatist networks in the place of populist, socialist and grassroots movements struggling for electoral and institutional reforms). Other potential arguments include: the receding threat of the revolutionary left; moderate demands and the willingness to compromise on the part of these left-wing movements in order to avoid any relapse into authoritarianism; international condemnation of violations of human rights.

Argentina might prove a popular example. A reference to the Malvinas/Falklands War can be made, but the answer should not focus on the war itself. Pinochet’s Chile might prove a popular example. Better candidates might challenge the extent to which democracy was restored in these countries.